

June 6, 2003

Keith Klein, Manager  
U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations  
P.O. Box 550 (A7-50)  
Richland, WA 99352

Tom Fitzsimmons, Director  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

John Iani, Regional Administrator  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
1200 Sixth Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101

**Re: Revised Draft Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement**

Dear Messrs. Klein, Fitzsimmons, & Iani,

- 1 | The Hanford Advisory Board (Board) has reviewed the revised draft of the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW EIS). While this EIS contains significantly more detail than the original draft, the EIS is still insufficient in terms of scope and detail.
- 2 | The Board has previously advised the Department of Energy (DOE) to analyze the cumulative impacts from all Hanford wastes on Hanford soil, groundwater, the Columbia River and the people living downstream from Hanford. DOE has promised this analysis since 1997 in the Waste Management Programmatic EIS (WMPEIS). This HSW EIS provided DOE the appropriate opportunity to conduct that analysis. DOE chose not to.
- 3 | The revised draft HSW EIS is not a site-wide EIS. We advise DOE to first integrate all Hanford-specific actions into a Hanford site-wide EIS to determine the aggregate impacts from all Hanford cleanup actions and decisions. Once that is done, then DOE can perform an analysis of the impacts of receiving, treating and disposing of offsite wastes destined for Hanford, combining the results of that analysis with the Hanford-only waste analysis to achieve a truly cumulative analysis of the impact of DOE's proposals.

HAB Consensus Advice #148  
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS  
Adopted: June 6, 2003  
Page 1

Nevertheless, the Board believes that if the following deficiencies are addressed, a revised draft would be adequate to support specific decisions for only Hanford-origin wastes.

- 4 | • **This draft EIS does not address all existing Hanford wastes, nor does it integrate the assessment of the Environmental Restoration wastes with the tank wastes.**  
Some examples of the wastes not adequately analyzed include:
  - 5 | ○ Residual waste DOE proposes to leave in tanks;
  - 6 | ○ Leaked tank wastes;
  - 7 | ○ Wastes in related ancillary equipment and piping;
  - 8 | ○ Hazardous or mixed wastes buried in the low-level burial grounds, and releases from the burial grounds;
  - 9 | ○ Transuranic wastes in burial grounds;
  - 10 | ○ Waste currently uncharacterized and stored in the PUREX tunnels;
  - 11 | ○ K-Basins sludges; and
  - 12 | ○ Disposal of immobilized low activity waste (ILAW) that is an alternate waste form.
  
- 13 | • **This draft EIS does not conduct the required ecosystems analysis.**  
Washington State's Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) details a specific road map for ecological evaluations. It is unfortunate DOE chose not to use this road map. The Columbia River is vitally important to the region. The analyses performed should include a detailed analysis of the impacts in and to the river and its ecosystem, as well as to the other interconnected ecosystems.
  
- 14 | • **Compliance and analysis points in this draft EIS are unacceptable.**  
The HSW EIS analyzes the potential impacts to groundwater at a line one kilometer away from the proposed disposal sites. This is inadequate and DOE should analyze the potential impacts at the edge of, and under, the disposal sites in the vadose zone and groundwater. Additionally, DOE should analyze the potential worst-case impacts from overlapping releases. Future releases from these disposals, which exceed regulatory limits, will trigger additional cleanup requirements under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and/or the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).
  
- 15 | • **This draft EIS makes a claim of irreversible and irretrievable commitment of groundwater due to contamination.**
  - 16 | ○ Groundwater is a State resource, not a Federal resource. DOE lacks authority to decide to allow contamination of groundwater to levels that prevent future use – and “irreversible and irretrievable commitment.” This

- 16** | claim should be deleted. Moreover, DOE notes in response to Board Advice Number 133 (attached) that the claim is only made due to existing plumes and contamination, which are not within the scope of this EIS.
- Both State and Federal law for environmental cleanup require the protection of groundwater.
- 17** | • **This draft EIS assumes all ILAW will be in the borosilicate glass waste form.**  
Should DOE proceed with decisions based on this draft of the HSW EIS, the Board believes DOE is committing to a performance standard equivalent to glass, regardless of the waste form.
- 18** | • **This draft EIS analysis shows all alternatives exceed regulatory limits.**  
○ DOE uses as its benchmark in the HSW EIS the DOE 25 millirem all sources limit. This dose, however, is not the legally controlling standard for cleanup decisions or for permitting of mixed waste facilities. This dose is greater than the EPA's and State's required regulatory risk ranges.
- 19** | ○ DOE fails to address either the specific EPA or MTCA carcinogen-risk standards for radionuclides, or the State and Federal anti-degradation standards, which are applicable to this analysis.
- If the above concerns are addressed in a revised draft EIS, the specific Hanford-only waste decisions the HSW EIS could support would be limited to:
- 20** | ❖ Whether to use an existing facility or build a new facility to treat waste;  
❖ Whether to dispose of Hanford low-level waste (LLW), mixed low-level waste (MLLW), and ILAW in a common facility or continue to use separate disposal operations;  
❖ Where such disposal facilities should be located; and  
❖ Whether to continue existing disposal practices or move to larger facilities with liners and leachate collection capability.
- 21** | A comprehensive EIS, integrating all impacts from both Hanford and offsite waste, is required before offsite importation decisions can be made. Some questions that have not yet been adequately addressed in either the WMPEIS or this draft EIS are:
- 22** | • **An adequate transportation analysis has not been performed.**  
• For example, the HSW EIS estimated impacts in Oregon and Washington using generic transportation parameters. It does not consider the specific transport route conditions, which may result in alternate routes being used and the impacts on those routes.

**Environmental Restoration wastes (not adequately addressed in the WMPEIS)**

- The Board advised DOE in Advice Number 133 that many stakeholders felt that the WMPEIS analysis was not detailed enough to support selection of Hanford as a repository for complex-wide disposal of LLW and MLLW. The WMPEIS excluded Environmental Restoration waste from analysis. Consequently, the WMPEIS can make no decisions, and it provides no authority for deciding what to do with such wastes. The WMPEIS notes:

*"If DOE had sufficient information about the ER transferred wastes, it would analyze their impacts in the same manner as the impacts of the WM wastes are evaluated in the WMPEIS. Unfortunately, DOE still does not have sufficient information on the volume or contaminant composition of these wastes to perform a meaningful impact evaluation at this time." Page 1-42*

*"Additionally, very little information is available to DOE about the composition of environmental wastes. This prevents the Department from evaluating the impacts of managing these wastes at this time." Page 1-42*

Under no circumstances should our advice be construed as a request or expectation for cleanup work at Hanford to be slowed or stopped pending these changes. Hanford cleanup progress can and should continue by using appropriate regulatory mechanisms to dispose of Hanford wastes in the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility and an appropriately licensed RCRA hazardous waste disposal facility for Hanford-only hazardous and mixed waste.

Sincerely,

Todd Martin, Chair  
Hanford Advisory Board

---

*This advice represents HAB consensus for this specific topic. It should not be taken out of context to extrapolate Board agreement on other subject matters.*

Attachment: Response to HAB Advice #133

HAB Consensus Advice #148  
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS  
Adopted: June 6, 2003  
Page 4

cc: Keith Klein, Manager, U.S. Department of Energy Richland Operations Office  
John Iani, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
Tom Fitzsimmons, Washington State Department of Ecology  
Marla Marvin, Deputy Designated Federal Official, U.S. Department of Energy  
Michael Gearheard, Environmental Protection Agency  
Michael Wilson, Washington State Department of Ecology  
Sandra Waisley, U.S. Department of Energy Headquarters  
The Oregon and Washington Congressional Delegations

U.S. Senators (OR)

Gordon H Smith  
Ron Wyden

U.S. Senators (WA)

Maria Cantwell  
Patty Murray

U.S. Representatives (OR)

Earl Blumenauer  
Peter DeFazio  
Darlene Hooley  
Greg Walden  
David Wu

U.S. Representatives (WA)

Brian Baird  
Norm Dicks  
Jennifer Dunn  
Jay Inslee  
Richard Hastings  
Rick Larsen  
Jim McDermott  
George Nethercutt  
Adam Smith

State Senators (WA)

Pat Hale  
Mike Hewitt

L-0039 (contd)

State Representatives (WA)

Jerome Delvin

Shirley Hankins

HAB Consensus Advice #148  
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS  
Adopted: June 6, 2003  
Page 6



## Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility

*Committed to public health through the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the reduction of human violence, and the promotion of a sustainable environment and economic and social justice.*

### WPSR Board of Sponsors

Bruce Arrundson, MD  
 Frederick Appelbaum, MD  
 Paul B. Benson, MD  
 William Bremner, MD  
 Rosemary Brooker, MD  
 Michael Copess, MD  
 Wayne Cull, MD  
 Federico Cruz-Urbe, MD, MPH  
 David Dale, MD  
 Patricia Dawson, MD  
 Susan Dachtelstein, MD  
 William L. Donnelly, PhD  
 Avery Sue Galvin, ABNP  
 Robi Garmez, DDO  
 Robert Haynes, MD  
 Paul Heston, MD  
 Kai Jollersten, MD  
 Aaron Katz, MPH  
 George Kraft, MD  
 James P. LoGerfo, MD  
 Rep. James McDermott, MD  
 Peter McGough, MD  
 John M. Neff, MD  
 Tom Noveck, MD  
 Gillian O'Brien, MD  
 Alonzo Plough, PhD, MPH  
 Thomas A. Preston, MD  
 Kirk Pringle, MD  
 Howard Rutter, MD  
 Richard Rappaport, MD  
 Richard E. Rust, MD  
 David Sierling, MD  
 Hugh Straley, MD  
 Stephen Tarruff, MD  
 Robert L. Thompson, MD

### WPSR Board of Directors

David Hall, MD  
 President  
 Charles Weems, MD  
 Vice President  
 Lysne Woodruff  
 Treasurer

Doreen Colby, MD  
 Roy Farrell, MD  
 Bill Finn  
 Michelle Garcia  
 Gertie Haynes  
 Katie Hester  
 J. David Heywood, MD  
 Kenneth Kagan, JD  
 Evan Kanter, MD, PhD  
 Wolfgang Kluge, MD  
 David Koch, MD  
 Judith Weirington, MD  
 Luke Magnotta, MD  
 Vera Peterson  
 Tim Takaro, MD, MPH  
 Jim Trombold, MD

### WPSR Staff

Martin Fleck  
 Executive Director  
 Heather Brulz  
 Nancy Dickstein  
 Jeanie Sedgely

### National Board of Directors

David Hall, MD  
 Roy Farrell, MD  
 Evan Kanter, MD, PhD  
 Jim Trombold, MD

June 6, 2003

Michael Collins  
 Document Manager  
 U.S. Dept. of Energy  
 Richland Operations Office  
 P.O. Box 550 MSIN A6-38  
 Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Collins:

Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility shares the concerns of our colleagues at the Washington Academy of Family Physicians, as reflected in this resolution adopted May 15, 2003. Please include the attached in your public comments on the revised draft Hanford Solid Waste EIS.

Sincerely,

Martin D. Fleck  
 Executive Director

Jeanie Sedgely  
 Hanford Issues Coordinator

4554 12th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98105 • Phone: (206) 547-2630 • Fax: (206) 547-2631 • [www.wpsr.org](http://www.wpsr.org)

Printed on recycled, chlorine-free paper

WPSR is the US affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War

*Washington Academy of Family Physicians*

5. **RESOLUTION #1 – HANFORD:**

Reference Committee #2 recommends that the Resolution #1-Hanford be **ADOPTED AS AMENDED:**

**1** | RESOLVED, That the WAFP opposes the import of additional nuclear wastes to Hanford Nuclear Reservation at least until the current waste at the overburdened Hanford is in compliance with state and federal regulations, and be it further

**2** | RESOLVED, That the WAFP opposes any "accelerated cleanup" of Hanford Nuclear Reservation tank wastes that is not scientifically demonstrated to be superior to vitrification in providing long-term protection of human health and the environment, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the WAFP delegates to the AAFP bring the issue of nuclear waste disposal at Hanford Nuclear Reservation, and the scientific merits of "accelerated cleanup," to the attention of the AAFP delegates from states that transport their nuclear waste to Hanford and ask the AAFP delegates from these states to be involved in a national dialogue for determining the fate of the nation's nuclear waste and be it further

RESOLVED, That the WAFP delegates to the AAFP provide appropriate background information about nuclear cleanup to the AAFP delegates from states that transport nuclear waste to Hanford Nuclear Reservation, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the WAFP inform and educate the Washington state Congressional delegation of the WAFP's position on issues of waste disposal at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

*Adopted May 15, 2003*